

DATE: August 24, 2020

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2008071

TO: Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms
ATTN TO: Monique Forte, Urban Planner III
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review



Digital signature
Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI with regard to its relationship to regional plans, goals and policies – and impacts it may have on the activities, plans, goals and policies of other local jurisdictions as well as state, federal and other agencies. This final report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the host local government.

Name of Proposal: GT Technology Enterprise Park (DRI #3131)

Submitting Local Government: City of Atlanta

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact **Date Opened:** August 7 2020 **Date Closed:** August 24 2020

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposed project to build a mixed-use project at Georgia Tech Technology Enterprise Park, located at the southeast corner of Northside Drive (US 41/SR 3) and North Avenue (US 29/SR 8) in the City of Atlanta. The project proposes 610,000 SF of industrial space, 1 million SF of office space, 100,000 SF of commercial space, and 416 multifamily apartment units. The local trigger is a rezoning from I-1 and I-2 to I-MIX. Expected buildout is 2029.

Comments: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), a component of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is located in the Region Core area, which is the densest part of the Atlanta region. Connected with transit, it is the most walkable area of metro Atlanta, and redevelopment is the main driver of growth. The Region Core and Regional Employment Corridor areas together contain 26 percent of the 10-county region's jobs and eight percent of the region's population. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. Those policy recommendations are listed at the bottom of this report.

This DRI appears to manifest many aspects of regional policy in that it appears to generally align with the existing Upper Westside LCI plan; converts an underutilized site to an infill, mixed-use development with new multifamily housing and a significant economic development opportunity as an expansion of Georgia Tech's Technology Enterprise Park. It supports transit use with nearby MARTA bus routes and Georgia Tech shuttle services. The inclusion of some retail/restaurant uses offers the potential for site residents and

employees to work and/or shop on site, and for visitors to park once or arrive via alternative modes and conduct multiple trips on foot. Along these lines, care should be taken to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas.

As of this writing, the submitted site plan only depicts building “envelopes,” with basic uses, density, and number of parking spaces on each parcel within the development. Pedestrian and vehicle entrances are not indicated, which makes it difficult to understand internal site circulation. It does not indicate locations of transit and ride-hailing services in relation to the various uses. Bike facilities are shown on some of the internal streets, but it’s not clear whether there is a larger plan to facilitate alternative modes. The two-way cycletrack depicted on Streets B, C, and E is not an accepted roadway configuration for bike facilities by most standards, unless it is protected with no parking on the side. It would be preferable to implement aggressive traffic calming with shared space on all interior streets rather than a mix of shared streets and separated facilities. Attention to alternative modes is all the more important considering the likely tenant mix for all uses will include students, many of whom don’t own or use personal automobiles. Bike racks and spaces for shared mobility options, such as bike-share and scooters, should be clearly identified and logically placed throughout the site. It will also be critical to provide reliable shuttle service to the site as part of the Georgia Tech system, but this will require a funding partnership between the development entity and the shuttle service, which is funded by student fees.

On the periphery of the site, this DRI is a major opportunity to restore an urban grid long after this area was broken into large “superblocks.” Directly south of the site is the Herndon Homes DRI #2677, which places residential and commercial uses, including a grocery store, in easy walking distance of residents and employees in this proposed DRI. Cameron M. Alexander Boulevard should effectively be considered a seam for these two DRIs, rather than a border, with multiple pedestrian crossings. A previous iteration of this DRI’s site plan showed an additional street connection of Gray Street between Cameron Alexander and Northyards Boulevard. Further discussion of this connection during a call on GRTA staff recommendations revealed that the street was abandoned by the City and the ownership and control of the parcel is undetermined. At a minimum, a pedestrian connection on this block will be beneficial pending some resolution on the property. To the north, the grade change along North Avenue makes it difficult to improve pedestrian accessibility to North Avenue. The proposed new signal at North and Northyards Boulevard will be an improvement with crosswalks, but it should include islands to offer better protection considering the long crossing distances and high driving speeds on North Avenue. This proposed signal will likely be opposed by Georgia DOT because of concerns about its distance from the intersection at Northside Drive, but it would improve accessibility and safety for users seeking to access the DRI.

The intensity of this proposed project generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in the Region Core. The proposed development is located in the Upper Westside LCI area and appears to be generally consistent with the LCI plan's recommendations, particularly in terms of the proposed land use mix for this part of the study area. Additional ARC staff comments and external comments received during the review, are included in this report. Further to the above, regional policy recommendations for the Region Core include:

- Continue to invest in the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program to assist local governments in center planning and infrastructure.
- Prioritize preservation of existing transit while increasing frequency and availability of transit options.– Encourage compact infill development, redevelopment and adaptive reuse.
- Create a range of housing options to accommodate all sectors of the workforce.
- Encourage active, ground floor, pedestrian-scale design, and pedestrian amenities, in new development and the redevelopment of existing sites.

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY	ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS	ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	GRTA/SRTA
FULTON COUNTY	MARTA	MIDTOWN ALLIANCE
CENTRAL ATLANTA PROGRESS	UPPER WESTSIDE CID	

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Greg Giuffrida at (470) 378-1531 or ggiuffrida@atlantaregional.org. This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews>.



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[Tier Map](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)

DRI #3131

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Initial DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local
Government: Atlanta

Individual completing form: Monique Forte

Telephone: 4045460196

E-mail: MBForte@AtlantaGA.gov

*Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: GT Technology Enterprise Park

Location (Street Address, North Avenue and Northside Drive. Bounded by North Avenue to the north, Marietta Street to the east,
GPS Coordinates, or Legal
Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project: Approximately 18.8 acres of mixed-use that consists of approximately 1,710,000 SF of commercial, office, and industrial land uses and 416 units of multi-family residential land uses.

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Mixed Use | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial | <input type="radio"/> Airports | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input type="radio"/> Wholesale & Distribution | <input type="radio"/> Attractions & Recreational Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Intermodal Terminals |
| <input type="radio"/> Hospitals and Health Care Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Post-Secondary Schools | <input type="radio"/> Truck Stops |
| <input type="radio"/> Housing | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Any other development types |
| <input type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 610,000 SF industrial, 1,000,000 SF office, 100,000 SF commercial, 416 multi-family residential unit

Developer: VLP 4, LLC

Mailing Address: 213 Lyman Hall

Address 2:

City: Atlanta State: Ge Zip: 30308

Telephone: 404-385-2692

Email: tony.zivalich@gatech.edu

Is property owner different from developer/applicant? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, property owner: Other parcels owned by VLP 3, LLC and TUFF TEPB, LLC

Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide the following information: Project Name:
Project ID:

[Back to Top](#)

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:

- ☒ Rezoning
☐ Variance
☐ Sewer
☐ Water
☐ Permit
☐ Other

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? ☐ (not selected) Yes ☐ No

If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?

Estimated Project: This project/phase: 2029
Completion Dates: Overall project: 2029



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[Tier Map](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)

DRI #3131

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the proposed DRI. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government: Atlanta
Individual completing form: Monique Forte
Telephone: 4045460196
Email: MBForte@AtlantaGA.gov

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: GT Technology Enterprise Park
DRI ID Number: 3131
Developer/Applicant: Georgia Advanced Technology Ventures, Inc.
Telephone: 404-385-2692
Email(s): tony.zivalich@gatech.edu

Additional Information Requested

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.

Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: \$750 million

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$9 million

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Will this development displace any existing uses?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc):

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: City of Atlanta

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.50 MGD

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:

Is a water line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: City of Atlanta

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.40 MGD

Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Land Transportation

How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.) Net New project trips: Daily trips, 15,174 (7,587 enter/7,587 exit) AM Peak: 1,006 enter/283 exit, PM Peak: 361 enter/934 exit

Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe below: Refer to DRI #3131 transportation analysis for details.

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 8114 tons

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please explain:

Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? 93%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Underground detention, green infrastructure, stormwater planters, infiltration systems, and re-use systems

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:

1. Water supply watersheds? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

3. Wetlands?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
4. Protected mountains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
5. Protected river corridors?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
6. Floodplains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
7. Historic resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:

[Back to Top](#)

Greg Giuffrida

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 9:21 AM
To: Greg Giuffrida
Cc: Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; Robinson, Joseph
Subject: FW: ARC DRI Review Notification - GT Technology Enterprise Park DRI 3131
Attachments: ARC Preliminary Report - GT Technology Enterprise Park DRI 3131.pdf

Greg,

The proposed mixed-use project at Georgia Tech Technology Enterprise Park, is located at the southeast corner of Northside Drive (US 41/SR 3) and North Avenue (US 29/SR 8) in the City of Atlanta. The project proposes 610,000 SF of industrial space, 1 million SF of office space, 100,000 SF of commercial space, and 416 multifamily apartment units, and is more than 6 miles from any civil airport. The proposed project does not appear to impact any civil airports.

However, the proposed development is in proximity to a navigation facility and may impact the assurance of navigation signal reception, so an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration according to the FAA's Notice Criteria Tool found here (<https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/gisTools/gisAction.jsp?action=showNoNoticeRequiredToolForm>). Those submissions for the building and any associated cranes may be done online at <https://oeaaa.faa.gov>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notifications, no later than 120 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impacts of the project on protected airspace associated with the airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development.

Alan Hood

Airport Safety Data Program Manager



Aviation Programs

600 West Peachtree Street NW
6th Floor
Atlanta, GA, 30308
404.660.3394 cell
404.532.0082 office

From: Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2020 10:31 AM
To: Andrew Spiliotis <aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov>; Annie Gillespie <agillespie@srta.ga.gov>; Boone, Eric <eboone@dot.ga.gov>; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov'; 'chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us'; 'cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov'; 'davinwilliams@dot.ga.gov'; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. <mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>; DeNard, Paul <pdenard@dot.ga.gov>; Finch, Ashley M <AFinch@dot.ga.gov>; Fowler, Matthew <mfowler@dot.ga.gov>; Greg Floyd - MARTA <gfloyd@itsmarta.com> <gfloyd@itsmarta.com>; Hatch, Justin A <juhatch@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Johnson, Lankston <lajohnson@dot.ga.gov>; Jon West <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; Zahul, Kathy <kzahul@dot.ga.gov>; 'kclark@gefa.ga.gov'; Matthews, Timothy W <TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Mertz, Kaycee <kmertz@dot.ga.gov>; Montefusco, Joshua M <JMontefusco@dot.ga.gov>;

GT TECHNOLOGY ENTERPRISE PARK DRI
City of Atlanta
Natural Resources Group Review Comments

July 30, 2020

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over this project, the Natural Resources Group has identified City and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

Watershed Protection

The entire proposed project is located in the Proctor Creek watershed, which is part of the Chattahoochee River watershed and enters the river downstream of the Region's water intakes.

Stream Buffers

No streams are shown on either the submitted site plan or the USGS coverage for the project area. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the City of Atlanta's Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any unmapped State waters identified on the property will be subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer.

Stormwater/Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality.

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) such as design standards, calculations, formulas, and methods. Where possible, the project should use stormwater better site design practices included in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual, Volume 2, Section 2.3.

During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements.

Development of Regional Impact Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3131
DRI Title GT Technology
County Fulton County
City (if applicable) City of Atlanta
Address / Location located north of Cameron Alexander Blvd, east of Northside Drive (US 19/US 41/SR 3), west of Norfolk Southern Railroad, and south of North Avenue (US 78/US 29/SR 8)

Proposed Development Type: Approximately 18.75 acres site consisting of 416 multifamily units, 1,000,000 square feet (sf) offices, 100,000 sf retail, 610,000 sf ft Industrial

Review Process ☒ EXPEDITED
☐ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham
Copied [Click here to enter text.](#)
Date July 30, 2020

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared By: Kimley Horn
Date July 1, 2020

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

01. Did the traffic analysis incorporate all projects contained in the current version of the fiscally constrained RTP which are within the study area or along major transportation corridors connecting the study area with adjacent jurisdictions?

☒ YES *(provide the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)*

☐ NO *(provide comments below)*

Programmed projects are identified on page 24 and in Appendix E of the traffic analysis.

REGIONAL NETWORKS

02. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Thoroughfares?

A Regional Thoroughfare is a major transportation corridor that serves multiple ways of traveling, including walking, bicycling, driving, and riding transit. It connects people and goods to important places in metropolitan Atlanta. A Regional Thoroughfare's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Thoroughfares serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Thoroughfare, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☐ NO

☒ YES *(identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)*

The development proposes three site access points, one on North Avenue(SR 8), one on Northside Drive (SR 3), and one on Cameron Madison Alexander. North Avenue and Northside Drive are identified as regional thoroughfares.

03. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes?

A Regional Truck Route is a freeway, state route or other roadway which serves as a critical link for the movement of goods to, from and within the Region by connecting airports, intermodal/multimodal facilities, distribution and warehousing centers and manufacturing clusters with the rest of the state and nation. These facilities often serve a key mobility and access function for other users as well, including drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A Regional Truck Route's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Truck Routes serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Truck Route, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☐ NO

☒ YES (*identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points*)

Northside Drive and North Avenue are identified as Regional Freight Thoroughfare however the development site is located inside the perimeter where freight traffic is limited.

04. If the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (*nearest station more than one mile away*)

☐ RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (*provide additional information below*)

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station North Avenue (1.2 miles)

Distance* ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
 ☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile
 ☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
 ☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

☐ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets

☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

Transit Connectivity

☐ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station

☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station

☐ No services available to rail station

☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

** Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site*

05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (*rail service already exists*)

☐ NOT APPLICABLE (*accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

☐ NO (*no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity*)

☐ YES (*provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below*)

☐ CST planned within TIP period

☐ CST planned within first portion of long range period

☐ CST planned near end of plan horizon

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the connection a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☐ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)

☒ SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator(s) MARTA

Bus Route(s) 26, 50, 51 and 94

Distance* ☒ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☒ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (No Sidewalks or accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access* Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity

☒ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☐ NO

☒ YES

MARTA, GRTA Express (Georgia Tech Circular)

08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile away)

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility Eastside Beltline Trail (2 miles)

Distance ☐ Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible local road or drive aisle connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent arterial or collector roadway networks can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☒ OTHER (Please explain)

Cameron Alexander Blvd (local roads) provides access to adjacent parcels to the south of the development.

10. Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site plans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key destinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large acreage sites and where high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrians are possible.

- ☒ YES (sidewalks provided on all key walking routes and both sides of roads whenever practical and bicyclists should have no major issues navigating the street network)
- ☐ PARTIAL (some walking and bicycling facilities are provided, but connections are not comprehensive and/or direct)
- ☐ NO (walking and bicycling facilities within the site are limited or nonexistent)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development does not lend itself to internal walking and bicycling trips)
- ☐ OTHER (Please explain)

. Commercial and residential uses are separated from industrial office uses by Northyard Blvd. The site plan depicts pedestrian facilities adjacent and internal to the site

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☒ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- ☐ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

Sidewalks are adjacent to the development along Northside Drive and North Avenue. The site plan depicts proposed sidewalks internal and adjacent to the proposed site.

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

- ☐ YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)
- ☐ PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
- ☐ NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)
- ☒ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?

- ☐ UNKNOWN *(additional study is necessary)*
- ☒ YES *(based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)*
- ☐ NO *(see comments below)*

Click here to enter text.

14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?

- ☒ NO *(based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)*
- ☐ YES *(see comments below)*

15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):

Traffic analysis states that between 1000 – 1500 parking spaces provided while site plan shows over 2000.

SITE NOTES:

DRI #XXXX
OVERALL SITE AREA: ±25.02 AC
CURRENT ZONING: I-1, I-2
PROPOSED ZONING: I-MIX
OWNER: GEORGIA ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VENTURES, INC.

PROGRAM:
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS PER ACRE PER CITY OF ATLANTA CODE OF ORDINANCES: N/A
PARCEL ONE: 0 UNITS/ACRE
PARCEL TWO: 32.2 UNITS/ACRE
TOTAL: 22.4 UNITS/ACRE

TOTAL MAXIMUM BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE: 2,022,000 SF (46.42 AC)

FLOOR AREA RATIO:
NON-RESIDENTIAL PER CITY OF ATLANTA CODE OF ORDINANCES: 2.00

TOTAL: 2.50

THE OVERALL DEVELOPMENT SQUARE FOOTAGE SHALL NOT EXCEED 2,022,000 SF. THE MAXIMUM SQUARE FOOTAGE AND FAR IDENTIFIED FOR THE ENTIRE DEVELOPMENT, NOT ON A PARCEL BY PARCEL BASIS.

MINIMUM INDUSTRIAL SQUARE FOOTAGE SHALL EQUAL THE LESSER OF 30% OF THE TOTAL BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE OR THE MINIMUM ALLOWED BY I-MIX.

SITE NOTES:

CONTACTS:
APPLICANT: GEORGIA ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VENTURES, INC.
213 LYMAN HALL
ATLANTA, GA, 30308-1028
TONY ZIVALICH JR.
(404) 894-2000

ATTORNEY: MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP
1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER
3343 PEACHTREE RD NE
ATLANTA, GA 30326
JESSICA HILL
(404) 504-7754

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES
817 WEST PEACHTREE STREET, NW
THE BILTMORE, SUITE 601
ATLANTA, GA 30308
ELIZABETH JOHNSON, P.E..
(404) 419-8700

CIVIL ENGINEER: KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES
817 WEST PEACHTREE STREET, NW
THE BILTMORE, SUITE 601
ATLANTA, GA 30308
ZAC RANDOLPH, P.E.
(404) 419-8700

SITE NOTES:

NOTE:
• PROPOSED USES AND SQUARE FOOTAGE MAY BE REALLOCATED AMONG THE PARCELS PROVIDED THE TOTAL GSF AND THE AGGREGATE GSF ALLOWED FOR EACH USE IS NOT EXCEEDED
• PROPOSED PRIVATE ROADS MAY CHANGE AND BUILDING PADS MAY CHANGE TO ACCOMMODATE THESE ROADS
• SIDEWALKS TO BE PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF ATLANTA STANDARDS
• PARKING TO COMPLY WITH CITY OF ATLANTA CODE OF ORDINANCES

SITE PLAN LEGEND:

--- EXISTING PROPERTY LINE
--- PARCEL BOUNDARY LIMITS (±60 AC)
■ PROPOSED BUILDING

PARKING SUMMARY:

MINIMUM PARKING REQUIRED: 0 SPACES
MAXIMUM PARKING REQUIRED: 6,713 SPACES
• EATING AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS
• RESIDENTIAL USE
• ALL INDUSTRIAL USES, OFFICES, CLINICS, STUDIOS, AND COMMUTER, DATA ANALYSIS AND ALL OTHER NONRESIDENTIAL USES EXCEPT HOTEL

PARKING PROVIDED: 2,248 SPACES

ACTUAL AND REQUIRED PARKING AND OPEN SPACE CALCULATIONS WILL BE BASED ON ACTUAL CONSTRUCTED DENSITY.

PROPOSED LAND USES AND DENSITIES

LAND USE	UNIT	PROPOSED
INDUSTRIAL	SF	610,000 SF
RESIDENTIAL	UNITS	416 UNITS
OFFICE	SF	1,000,000 SF
COMMERCIAL*	SF	100,000 SF
TOTAL		1,710,000 SF / 416 UNITS

* ASSUMES 50% RETAIL & 50% RESTAURANT

LOCATION MAP

